

KIMBERLY A. SANCHEZ
Acting United States Attorney
SAM STEFANKI
Assistant United States Attorney
501 I Street, Suite 10-100
Sacramento, CA 95814
Telephone: (916) 554-2700
Facsimile: (916) 554-2900

Attorneys for Plaintiff
United States of America

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

DEONTE DESHAWN MORGAN,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 2:25-cr-00132-JAM

**SECOND STIPULATION AND ORDER TO
CONTINUE STATUS CONFERENCE AND
EXCLUDE TIME**

DATE: August 05, 2025
TIME: 9:00 a.m.
COURT: Hon. John A. Mendez

STIPULATION

Plaintiff United States of America (the “government”), by and through its counsel of record, and
defendant Deonte Deshawn Morgan, by and through his counsel of record, hereby stipulate as follows:

1. By previous order, this matter was set for status on August 05, 2025.
2. By this stipulation, the defendant now moves to **continue** the **status conference** until **September 09, 2025, at 9:00 a.m.**, and to exclude time between August 05, 2025, and September 09, 2025, under Local Code T4.
3. The parties agree and stipulate, and request that the Court find the following:
 - a) The government has represented that the discovery associated with this case includes over 200 pages of documents and records, as well as video and audio recordings. A significant portion of this discovery is subject to a protective order previously entered in this case

1 to safeguard the identity of a minor victim. All of this discovery has been either produced
2 directly to counsel and/or made available for inspection and copying.

3 b) Counsel for the defendant desires additional time to review the current charges,
4 conduct investigation and research related to the charges, review and copy produced discovery,
5 discuss potential resolutions with his client, and otherwise prepare for trial. This process requires
6 additional time due to the discovery-handling restrictions imposed by the protective order.

7 c) Counsel for the defendant believes that failure to grant the above-requested
8 continuance would deny him the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into
9 account the exercise of due diligence.

10 d) The government does not object to the continuance.

11 e) Based on the above-stated findings, the ends of justice served by continuing the
12 case as requested outweigh the interest of the public and the defendant in a trial within the
13 original date prescribed by the Speedy Trial Act.

14 f) For the purpose of computing time under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161,
15 et seq., within which trial must commence, the time period of August 05, 2025, to September 09,
16 2025, inclusive, is deemed excludable pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), B(iv) [Local Code
17 T4] because it results from a continuance granted by the Court at the defendant's request on the
18 basis of the Court's finding that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the
19 best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

4. Nothing in this stipulation and order shall preclude a finding that other provisions of the Speedy Trial Act dictate that additional time periods are excludable from the period within which a trial must commence.

IT IS SO STIPULATED.

Dated: July 23, 2025

KIMBERLY A. SANCHEZ
Acting United States Attorney

/s/ SAM STEFANKI
SAM STEFANKI
Assistant United States Attorney

Dated: July 23, 2025

/s/ DOUGLAS BEEVERS
DOUGLAS BEEVERS
Counsel for Defendant
DEONTE DESHAWN MORGAN

ORDER

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 25, 2025

/s/ John A. Mendez
THE HONORABLE JOHN A. MENDEZ
SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE